

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1 and 5 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-2, 4-6, 8, 11 and 13 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1 and 5 are independent claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendments do not add new matter to the application and are fully supported by the specification. Support for the amendments may be found at least in Figures 3B and 4-5.

In view of the above amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 11, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the amendments filed on August 30, 2005, in which claims 1 and 5 were amended to recite that the image display device is surrounded by an inner sealant having no plugged openings therein, is asserted by the examiner to contain new matter. Applicants have deleted this recitation from claims 1 and 5 for the sole purpose of expediting prosecution and do not intend to assent to examiner's position through these amendments. Because the offending recitations have been deleted, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 11, and 13.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 5, 6, 8, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Specifically, claim 5 was rejected for reciting "to all of each lateral side." Claims 6, 8

and 13 were rejected for their dependence upon claim 5. Applicants have amended claim 5 for the sole purpose of clarifying 5. This amendment is not made for the purpose of avoiding prior art or narrowing the claimed invention, and no change in claim scope is intended. Therefore, Applicants do not intend to relinquish any subject matter by this amendment. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 5-6, 8 and 13, as amended, fully comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection of claims 5-6, 8 and 13.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 11, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 6,391,137 issued to Matsushima ("Matsushima"), in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,766,493 issued to Shin ("Shin"), U. S. Patent No. 6,908,638 issued to Ueda, *et al.* ("Ueda"), and U. S. Patent No. 6,470,594 issued to Boroson, *et al.* ("Boroson"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the reference or references, when combined, must disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations. The motivation to modify the prior art and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based upon a patent applicant's disclosure. See *in re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

The cited references fail to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness over claims 1-2, 4-6, 8, 11 and 13. Assuming *arguendo* that the references may be combined and a reasonable

expectation of success exists, the combined references do not disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations.

Applicants respectfully assert that the references, either alone or in combination, fail to teach all features of claims 1 and 5. Claim 1 and claim 5 as amended each recite, *inter alia*, “wherein the combining comprises completely covering each lateral side of the combined upper and lower substrates with an unetchable protection film.” The cited references fail to teach at least this feature. The examiner looks to Shin to teach this feature of claims 1 and 5. However, Shin fails to teach that acid-resistant sealant 15 “completely cover[s] each lateral side of the combined upper and lower substrates.” Shin teaches that acid-resistant sealant 15 is merely used “to prevent foreign materials or strong acid from entering TFT device 11 and color filter 21.” See Shin, col. 4, lines 13-15. To the contrary, the present application completely covers each lateral side of the combined upper and lower substrates with an unetchable protection film to thus “prevent the sides of the upper and lower substrates 12 and 11 from being etched.” See Specification, page 8, lines 5-6. Accordingly, the cited references, either alone or in combination, fail to teach “wherein the combining comprises completely covering each lateral side of the combined upper and lower substrates with an unetchable protection film.”

Additionally, Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “wherein the image display devices are organic EL display devices.” Claim 5 recites, *inter alia*, “wherein the image display device is an organic EL display device.” The cited references fail to teach at least these features. The examiner looks to Ueda to teach these features of claims 1 and 5. Applicants respectfully disagree. Ueda is directed to an organic electroluminescent (EL) element and a method of manufacturing an organic EL element. As explained in Ueda’s specification, an organic EL element includes an “organic light-emitting layer interposed between a pair of opposing electrodes.” Contrary to the examiner’s position, an organic EL element does not teach an organic display device, which inherently includes more components than two electrodes and a light-emitting layer.

Moreover, the examiner has cited Ueda for providing a motivation to substitute Ueda's organic EL element for Matsushima's LCD device (namely, that Ueda's organic EL element "provides long service life," See Ueda, col. 18, line 28). However, since Ueda fails to teach an organic display device, the examiner has failed to provide a motivation to replace Matsushima's LCD device with an organic display device.

For at least these reasons, the cited references, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest every limitation of claims 1 and 5.

Since none of the other prior art of record, whether taken alone or in any combination, discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 5, and all the claims that depend therefrom, are allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 11, and 13.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submits that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/hae-chan park/

Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: August 3, 2006

CUSTOMER NUMBER: 58027

H.C. Park & Associates, PLC
8500 Leesburg Pike
Suite 7500
Vienna, VA 22182
Tel: 703-288-5105
Fax: 703-288-5139
HCP/WMH/alj